

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the *Final Office Action*. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's consideration of the Application. Claims 1, 4, 9, 12, 17, 20, and 25 have been amended. Claims 3, 11, and 19 have been cancelled. For at least the reasons discussed below, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Section 103(a) Rejection

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,948,040 to DeLorme et al. ("*DeLorme*") in light of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0095319 to Swart et al. ("*Swart*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 1, as amended, is allowable at least because the combination of *DeLorme* and *Swart* proposed by the Examiner fails to disclose, teach, or suggest, expressly or inherently, elements specifically recited in Applicants' claims. For example, the *DeLorme-Swart* combination fails to disclose, teach, or suggest "receiving prioritization information associated with the services" recited in amended independent Claim 1.

The Examiner cites column 26, lines 30-31 of *DeLorme* to teach a prior version of Claim 3. (Office Action, page 5, paragraph 11.) The passage at column 26, lines 29-33 of *DeLorme*, however, merely discloses, "... a TRIPS retail user might be motivated to start his or her travel planning session using the WHEN? menu at 161 in order to input the pre-arranged START and FINISH dates and times for his or her vacation." The passage does not disclose "receiving prioritization information associated with the services" of amended Claim 1.

For at least these reasons, independent Claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103. For analogous reasons, independent Claims 9, 17, 25, and 26 and their respective dependent claims are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all the pending claims.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this case in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact Keiko Ichiye, the Attorney for Applicants, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6494.

Although Applicants believe no fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants



Keiko Ichiye
Reg. No. 45,460

Date: May 5, 2008

Correspondence Address:

Customer Number: 05073